



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,392	06/25/2003	Eric R. Kern	RPS920030079US1	4794

47052 7590 07/31/2007
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP
PO BOX 51418
PALO ALTO, CA 94303

EXAMINER

BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/31/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/606,392

Applicant(s)

KERN ET AL.

Examiner

Benjamin R. Bruckart

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 22-25 and 36-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 22-25, 36-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

Claims 1, 21-25, 36-44 are pending in this Office Action.

Claim Objections

The claim objection has been withdrawn in light of applicant's amendment.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed in the amendment filed 7/11/07, have been fully considered but are moot in view of new grounds of rejection. The reasons are set forth below.

Applicant's invention as claimed:

Claims 1, 36; 22, 23; 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No. 20040181601 by Sakthikumar ("Sakt") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20020124114 by Bottom et al.

Regarding claim 1, the Sakthukumar reference teaches the method for providing access between a storage drive and a plurality of blade servers (Sakt: page 1-2, para 20 and 30), the method comprising:

configuring the plurality of blade servers to simultaneously connect with the storage drive wherein the plurality of blade servers is managed by a management system (Sakt: page 2, para 31, 33-34), and the storage drive is coupled to the management system (Sakt: page 2, para 29);
and

each blade server of the plurality of blade servers routing data packets between the management system and the blade server (Sakt: page 2, para 31, 33-35); and

the management system managing access of the plurality of blade servers to the storage drive including routing the data packets received from the plurality of blade servers to the storage drive (Sakt: page 2, para 31, 33-35).

The Sakt reference fails to state simultaneous access.

However, the Bottom reference teaches a plurality of blade servers in communication with simultaneous access to a network (Bottom: page 2, para 21) in order to provide and allow scalable blades access to the network while ensuring quality control access control (Bottom: page 2, para 22; page 1, para 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of providing access as taught by Sakt to include simultaneous access as taught by Bottom in order to provide and allow scalable blades access to the network while ensuring quality control access control (Bottom: page 2, para 22; page 1, para 8).

Regarding claim 36, the method of claim 1, wherein configuring the plurality of blade servers to simultaneously connect with the storage drive includes configuring each of the plurality of blade servers to have a separate interface for communicating with the storage drive (Bottom: page 2, para 21-22).

Claims 37 and 38; 24,25; 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No. 20040181601 by Sakthikumar ("Sakt") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20020124114 by Bottom et al in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,975,581 by Medina et al.

Regarding claim 37, the modified Sakt reference teaches the method of claim 36, wherein each blade server of the plurality of blade servers simultaneously routing data packets between the management system and the blade server includes each blade server routing data packets to and from the management system (Sakt: page 2, para 31, 33-35; Bottom: page 2, para 21).

The modified Sakt reference fails to state the VLAN protocol.

However, the Medina reference teaches using the Virtual Local Area Network (VLAN) protocol (Medina: col. 1, lines 45-51) in order to group the blade servers together and allow those servers to communicate with each other in virtual LANs (Medina: col. 1, lines 26-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of providing access as taught by the modified Sakt to include VLANs as taught by Medina in order

to group the blade servers together and allow those servers to communicate with each other in virtual LANs (Medina: col. 1, lines 26-60).

Regarding claim 38, the method of claim 37, wherein the storage drive is one of a diskette drive or a CDROM drive (Sakt: page 2, para 31).

Claims 39 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No. 20040181601 by Sakthikumar ("Sakt") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20020124114 by Bottom et al in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,975,581 by Medina et al in further view of U.S. Patent Publication 20030033517 by Rutherglen et al.

Regarding claim 39, the modified Sakt reference the method of claim 37, wherein:

the storage drive is a remote storage drive relative to the management system, the remote storage drive being coupled to a remote system that is in communication with the management system through a network (Sakt: page 2, para 31; Fig. 1).

The Sakt reference fails to teach using an applet.

However, the Rutherglen reference teaches using an applet to establish a connection between the remote storage drive and each blade server of the plurality of blade servers (Rutherglen: page 5, para 37-38) in order to make a secure connection between endpoints (Rutherglen: page 1, para 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of providing access as taught by the modified Sakt to include applets to make connections as taught by Rutherglen in order to make a secure connection between endpoints (Rutherglen: page 1, para 6).

Claims 22-25 and 40-44 are rejected under the same rationale as given above because they are substantially similar claims in scope.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R Bruckart whose telephone number 571-272-3982.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and after final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the examiner whose telephone number is 571-272-3982.

Application/Control Number: 10/606,392

Page 6

Art Unit: 2155

Benjamin R Bruckart

Examiner

Art Unit 2155



SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER